

with the tenets advocated, together with the attachment on "The Appraisal of Personal Characteristics in the Selection of Federal Employees Under the Merit System," as in agreement with the statements made. We, however, consider that there is quite a distinction between situational tests, paper and pencil tests, questionnaires, personality projective devices, ratings by supervisors, and interview procedures.

We feel that personality questionnaires are of use in a guidance situation where the client has the maximum to gain by telling the truth. They are of little or no value, other than of research, for any other purpose. Interest questionnaires, on the other hand, have considerable value in a vocational guidance situation. They have been shown to measure to a fair degree job satisfaction.

Although we do not claim to be clinical psychologists, we venture to make some statements about the clinical use of various personality tests. We feel that the ability to use clinical personality tests is more of an art than a science. No single projective device has very much reliability and validity by itself. On the other hand, the use of a number of projective devices to give indications have been shown to be valuable by those clinical psychologists that really know how to use them. We do not think that all clinical psychologists have the same efficiency in using these. The fault is not in the test as much as it is in the individual evaluating the results. In medicine we have a number of tests that have relatively no reliability but nonetheless are valuable to us in assisting the physician in diagnosis. The basal metabolism test is one such example.

We believe that in the use of medical examinations for fitness for duty and subsequent actions leading to separation, reassignment, or disability retirement, that the standards set must be very relevant to the specific job of the incumbent. We feel that the medical examiner should be given a statement of expected standards of performance so that he can make a valid determination as to the ability of the individual to perform it from a physical fitness standpoint. Concerning appraisal of individuals for hiring and promotion, the NFFE feels that although our present procedures are fairly good, we can greatly improve these by developing more and better performance measures. These, however, we realize, are quite costly to develop and administer. But the cost of inefficient Government is more expensive.

There has been much concern and publicity on the subjects of "personality testing" and "invasion of privacy" by Government snooping. The NFFE feels that much injustice is done to both parties concerned. As a result, the Government employee is caught in the middle on the horns of a dilemma. There are case studies on hand to emphasize the injustice to those we consider qualified and capable individuals, who are restricted in promotions and appointments because of "test scores" subjectively rated by amateur administrators and interpreters. At the same time, "the right of reasonable inquiry" also must be protected. Medical service would never have developed to its present sophisticated state without research. The issue and problem at hand is to develop a sensible policy so that incumbents are protected without impeding scientific research, even if some controversial matters are involved. Individuals should be carefully selected, should be well qualified, and all "testing" should be validated in light of the criteria previously itemized.

The committee's exposé on such test devices as the Minnesota Multiphasic Inventory containing questions on sex and religion that invade "privacy" has merit, but we ask the honorable members to also consider Acting Commissioner Ianni's announcement that USOE will "carefully review all questionnaires submitted to it, to prevent injuring public sensitivities in such matters as the challenging of established morals, the invasion of privacy, etc." Protection against capricious and self-proclaimed researchers is essential and the committee should be commended for its forthright investigation during these hearings and research. Less responsible Government officials are thus forewarned. The Federal support of research and Government operation warrants a "protective sphere." Measuring devices, like statistics, when misused, are harmful and destructive.

Wholesale testing should not be used, since it has proven to be conducive to misuse and reprisals. It should be limited to predetermined and needed areas.

The NFFE, in conclusion, offers the following constructive suggestion. Considering the high cost of contracting "testing and questionnaire" devices, would it not be to the Government's advantage to set up a centralized test development facility within its own structure (i.e., CSC or USOE). Staffed by competent and professional test construction specialists with supporting statisticians and expert analysts, performing all functions, better measuring and test administration applicable to functions concerned, would probably result at less cost. Done within the Government, checks on validity and reliability could be accomplished